



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE IDEA OF PRE-EXISTENCE IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL

R. H. STRACHAN

St. Columba's Presbyterian Church, Cambridge, Englan

There are various utterances that are put in the mouth of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel, that convey the idea of pre-existence as an integral part of his self-consciousness. These may be thus classified: (1) the various passages where he speaks of himself as "coming down from heaven" (3:13; 3:31; 6:33; 6:38); (2) "Before Abraham was, I am" (8:58); (3) "And now, O Father, glorify thou me with the glory which I had with thee, before the world was" (17:4, 5); (4) "Thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world" (17:24).

1. Are we to regard these utterances as the creation of the thought of the evangelist? Or are they to be regarded, if not necessarily verbally accurate, yet as expressing a real aspect of the consciousness of Jesus?¹ On the former hypothesis, they are to be connected with the thought of the Prologue, and in them the evangelist applies to the person of Jesus the dogmatic conception of his person with which, it is supposed, he starts out to write his Gospel. Jesus is represented as speaking in the person of the *Logos* incarnate. Before his incarnate existence, he lived in glory with the Father, and brings with him into the world the memory of that pre-temporal existence. If that interpretation holds, we have no other alternative than to regard the consciousness of Jesus in this respect of pre-existence, in the Fourth Gospel, as entirely the creation of the evangelist under the influence of the *Logos* theology. It may, however, seriously be questioned, whether, supposing that these utterances are thus regarded as springing from the thought of the Prologue, such an expression of the consciousness

¹ It may be noted that the conception of Jesus as chosen by a pre-temporal act of God for his mission on earth is not peculiarly Johannine, e.g., Matt. 3:17; 12:18, where the tenses of *ἡρέμισα*, and *εὐδόκησα* are adapted, in order to emphasize pre-temporal existence.

of pre-existence does not go considerably beyond the conception of the Prologue itself. The Prologue certainly identifies Jesus with the pre-existing Logos. But the Logos, at least in vss. 1-13 of the Prologue, is not personified in the sense that it is regarded as having a separate existence in relation to God. The word was *πρὸς τὸν θεόν*, but it is immediately added that the Logos was *θεός*. Here there appears that tendency that is apparent in the Hebrew thought regarding both the Word and Wisdom, to give what amounts to no more than a poetical quasi-personification to them. The tendency sprang from a certain unwillingness to bring the Holy God into immediate contact with the world and with men. This tendency existed side by side with another form of thought that represents God as directly fashioning and forming the world and men. The two tendencies are represented in the two accounts of creation in Genesis. In chap. 1, God's Spirit broods on the face of the deep. He speaks, and creation comes into being. In chap. 2, on the other hand, we have a much more anthropomorphic conception of God. "Instead of lifting God far above man and nature, this writer revels "in the most exquisite anthropomorphisms; he does not shrink from speaking of God as walking in the garden in the cool of the day, or making experiments for the welfare of his first creature (2:18 ff.), or arriving at a knowledge of man's sin by a searching examination" (Skinner, *Genesis*, p. 51). The reaction from this anthropomorphic point of view is responsible for the idea that God in his work of creation must employ an intermediary, and in this case the intermediary is the Word of God. However far this reaction proceeded in the direction of really personifying the agencies employed, in subsequent thought, e.g., in the post-canonical books, and in the Targums, there can be little doubt that in the canonical Scripture itself we have no more than quasi-personification. And it seems to me that the fourth evangelist in his statement in 1:1, that the "*Logos* was God," is really only saving himself from a denial of monotheism.¹ The Prologue certainly identifies Jesus with the Logos, but the identification sounds much more like an attempt to state semi-philosophically, with Greek readers and popular Greek thought in view, a conclu-

¹ Cf. Abelson, *The Immanence of God in Rabbinical Literature*, p. 161.

sion to which the evangelist had come through reflection on the life and consciousness of Jesus, rather than like an attempt to give a dogmatic interpretation to his person, which will also exercise a molding influence upon his version of Jesus' life and words. I believe that the only way to understand the Fourth Gospel is to regard the Prologue as a preface, written after the rest of the Gospel was written, and intended to commend it to the Greek world.

On the other hand, if the conception of pre-existence in the Gospel itself goes in definiteness beyond the thought of the Prologue, it certainly lags behind it in scope. In the Prologue, the Logos is the agency through which the world was created. It is clear that the Prologue is written with Gen., chap. 1, in view. It describes the New Creation, the coming into existence of the *κόσμος*. And it is not the conception of the creative activity of the Logos that determines the evangelist's conception of the person of Jesus, but vice versa. He reflects upon the miracles and the words and the life, and in the product of his reflection he sees an identification of the "Word" of Jewish religious thought, corresponding to the Logos of current Greek philosophy, with the life of which he speaks. It is impossible to assert that this creative activity of the Logos dominates the presentation of such a miracle as the Cana miracle, or the feeding of the five thousand, or the walking on the water, or the raising of Lazarus. Rather these suggested, and were not suggested by, the universal creative activity. So far as the idea of pre-existence is concerned, the pre-existence that is asserted of Jesus is the pre-existence of one who is more than Messiah, and yet not the pre-existence of a divine Logos, by which the worlds were made. In every case where pre-existence is asserted of Jesus, it is the pre-existence of the "Son," upon whom descended, "rested," the Spirit of Messiah in its completeness, and the "Son" is not merely the Messiah or Christ. The object of the Gospel is to prove that Jesus is the Christ. In this respect the thought of the pre-existent activity in the Gospel itself is less wide in scope than in the Prologue.

2. If, then, we are not to regard the pre-existence utterances of Jesus in the Gospel as really the product of the Logos conception in the Prologue, it is necessary to keep the other side of the question in view. In what sense is pre-existence regarded as an integral

part of the consciousness of Jesus in this Gospel? I shall proceed to examine at some length one passage that I shall treat as typical of the thought of pre-existence generally, viz., 8:58.

In order to understand this passage, it is necessary to go as far back as 5:51, in order to catch the drift of the whole. There Jesus is represented as saying, "If a man keep my word [λόγος], he shall not see death for ever." We note that the use of λόγος in the Gospel is distinct from that in the Prologue in certain important aspects. In the Gospel it seems to be used in a certain technical sense. In our Lord's use of Ps. 82, (8:35), ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ is the equipment necessary in order that the Rulers, of whom the psalm speaks, may worthily perform their office. They are those "to whom the word of the Lord came." Yet they did not keep that word, because they judged unrighteously. In consequence, "they shall die like men, and fall like one of the demons"¹ (5:7). In the Gospel, the λόγος is the intimate relationship between Jesus and the Father, which he not only had conferred upon him, but realized perfectly in his words and works. He is therefore able to mediate it perfectly to men. He gives this relationship to men, and if they keep it, they also shall live forever: "Because I live, ye shall live also" (14:19).² In answer to this claim to mediate eternal life, the Jews assert that this must be presumption on his part or madness. If Jesus possesses this Logos himself, he must necessarily possess that which it confers, viz., life forever, and must have lived forever. He must also be greater than Abraham or the prophets. Jesus, in reply, accepts the inference, and says that this glory is not presumptuously claimed by him, but has been given him by the Father. This assurance is brought to him by his own knowledge of God, i.e., his own self-consciousness, that perfect correspondence with God, which is the realization of the Logos of God which he has kept (vs. 55). Then he goes on to claim that he is greater than Abraham, who "exulted," *ἵνα ἴδῃ τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ἐμὴν, καὶ εἶδεν καὶ ἐχάρη* (vs. 56). The Jews emphasize the absurdity of this statement on the part of one who is "not yet

¹ Reading שָׂרִימ instead of שָׂרִימ.

² The conferring of the Logos-relationship on Jesus is the ground of his *υἱότης*, but that relationship as conferred upon men is described as the state of being *τέκνα*.

fifty years old," i.e., who has not yet attained to perfect manhood. The reference is to the idea that Messiah was to appear suddenly and mysteriously as a full-grown man. The reference is not meant to bring into prominence so much the question of age, as the question of his claim to Messiahship. Evidently the reading *ἑώρακας* has been substituted for the other *ἑώρακέν σε* (Nestle, *Textual Criticism*, 289), because the emphasis was thought to lie upon the fact that Jesus was not old enough to have seen Abraham. The absurdity to the Jews consists in the notion that Abraham is said to have seen one like the speaker, who had not yet attained to that perfection of manhood, associated with the Messiah. Jesus replies to this in the enigmatic words, *πρὶν Ἀβρ' ἀδμ γενέσθαι ἐγὼ εἰμὶ*. The words imply existence before Abraham, but in what sense has yet to be determined.

Two questions emerge: (1) What is the significance of the saying that Abraham "exulted to see my day"? (2) The significance of *ἐγὼ εἰμὶ*. Is bare existence predicated? or is there an ellipsis after *εἰμὶ*? Let us take these questions in order.

(1) What is meant by "my day"? We may understand the passage as meaning that Abraham exulted to see, in spiritual prevision, the day of Jesus' appearance upon earth. It is difficult to find the source of the idea directly in the Old Testament narrative. In Gen., chap. 21, a son is promised to Abraham, and through that son a posterity in which all nations of the earth "shall bless themselves."¹ Abraham is represented as "laughing" when the birth of Isaac is promised, and the exulting of Abraham in the Johannine passage is usually applied directly to this laughter. Loisy, *Le Quatrième Évangile*, p. 581, regards the event referred to in 8:56 as a prophetic vision connected with the birth of Isaac, "soit prise en elle-même, soit complétée en quelque façon, comme figure, par la scène du sacrifice" (Gen. 22:1-18). Apart from the difficulty that nothing is said of a vision to Abraham at this stage, except in so far as the promise and its acceptance is such, another objection to this view is that the "laughter" in Genesis is ambiguously² regarded. Sarah is represented as laughing out of incredulity in 18:12 ff., and out of

¹ I.e., invoke for themselves a blessing similar to that of the Hebrew people.

² This is due of course to the presence of different sources.

joy in 21:6; while Abraham is represented as laughing also in 17:17, but only incredulously, as vs. 18 shows. He is not represented at all as laughing joyously unless such laughter is implied in 21:6, where Sarah says, "Everyone will laugh with me." Even here a probable alternative translation is proposed. Instead of "with me" it is proposed to translate "at me." It is therefore difficult to suppose that ἡγαλλιάσατο refers to the meaning of the name Isaac. In addition, it may be suggested that the mood described in "exulted" denotes a somewhat stronger emotion than merely joyful laughter. Also the laughter spoken of in Gen. 21:6 is not in the text connected with any messianic expectation, but is simply the joy of the barren woman who is promised a child, granting that her laughter is interpreted as joyous.

At this point we meet with a phenomenon which, as will be seen, is elsewhere characteristic of the Fourth Gospel, viz., that its thought more than once seems to imply a subsequent tradition imposed upon the thought of the Old Testament canonical books. Here, evidently some form of the Genesis tradition is before the evangelist, in which Abraham's laughter is interpreted as ἀγαλλίασις, in view of the coming of Messiah. Philo (*De mutatione nominum*, 29 f.) compares the "laughing" of Abraham to the "laughing" of the day in anticipation of the early dawn: and playing on the meaning of the name of Isaac, who was not yet born, he declares that Abraham "so to speak, laughed before laughter existed, as the soul, through hope, rejoices before joy, and delights before delight." He interprets Abraham's falling on his face (Gen. 17:17) as "an act of adoration and an excess of divine ecstasy."¹

In the Book of Jubilees (135-105 B.C. [Charles]), frequent mention is made of Abraham's "rejoicing" or "being glad," in connection with the revelations made to him. This book consists largely of a revision and retelling of Genesis, and in it everything is removed that could shock the feelings of the Pharisees. We may here give some quotations from the book. "We [the angels] went our way and announced to Sara what we had said to him [Abraham], and they both had very great joy. And he built here an altar to God, who had delivered him, and who had made him to rejoice in the

¹ Cf. Abbott, *Johannine Grammar*, 2097, 2688-89.

land where he had been a stranger" (16:19, 20). The book represents Abraham as instituting the Feast of Tabernacles at this time. "He offered praise, and rejoiced, and named the name of this Feast a Feast of God, the Joy of the Good pleasure of the most High God." Again, on his deathbed, Isaac is represented as sending to him by the hand of Jacob a thank-offering, and after he has partaken of it Abraham offers prayer. "I thank thee humbly, My God, that thou hast allowed me to see this day My God, may thy goodness and thy peace be upon thy servant, and upon the seed of his sons that he may be to thee a chosen people, and an heritage out of all the peoples of the earth from now on, and unto all the days of the races of the earth to all eternity" (22:7-9).

It is clear that we have here traces of a later tradition in which Abraham's laughter is represented without offense as implying joy in believing, and not incredulity. The thought in 8:56 is evidently based on some such tradition. The idea is that Abraham exults in the days of his flesh, with the result that he sees the day of the Messiah.

We have still further to explain *τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ἐμήν*. A Valentinian quotation of 8:56 from Clement of Alexandria (973) is given by Abbott (*Johannine Grammar*, 2689, o), which stops at *τ. ἡμερ. τ. ἐμήν*, and continues, *τὴν ἐν σαρκὶ παρουσίαν. ὅθεν ἀναστὰς ὁ κύριος εὐηγγελίσσατο τοὺς δικαίους τοὺς ἐν τῇ ἀναπαύσει καὶ μετέστησεν αὐτοὺς. . . .* The reference is apparently to Abraham in Hades waiting to be liberated by the Savior. Also in an eschatological passage in Jub. 23:30-31, it is said: "Then will God save his servants, and they will be exalted, and shall behold deep peace, and will drive away their enemies, and the righteous will behold and give thanks, and rejoice to all eternity in joy. . . . And their bones will rest in the earth, and their spirit will have much joy, and they will know that it is God who holds judgment, and exercises grace upon hundreds and thousands, and upon all who love him."

We may therefore regard the vision of "my day" as also a vision given to Abraham in his after-existence. This is the reference in *εἶδεν*. A great probability that this thought underlies the passage consists in the fact that the continued existence of Abraham, not

in Sheol, but in Paradise, is a part of the argument all through the passage. In John 8:53, the Jews speak of Abraham as one who is "dead." It is also to be borne in mind that the argument begins with the statement *θάνατον οὐ μὴ θεωρήσῃ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα* (vs. 51); and that it is necessary for Jesus to uphold this assertion all through the encounter. Jesus does not let fall entirely the idea of the continued existence of Abraham elsewhere than in Sheol, which is the same thing as death. It is a step that leads up to the assertion of his own pre-existence. Abraham is in his place in Paradise, because he has seen this day, which even in the days of his flesh he saw in spiritual pre-vision ("rejoiced to see": *ἵνα* must have a future significance).

We have at least two passages from the Testaments of the XII Patriarchs, which, if they do not directly suggest the conception in 8:56, at least betray the existence of a similar class of ideas in the apocalyptic literature. In Test. Benj. 10:5, it is said that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob left as an inheritance to their descendants that they should keep the commandments of God, until the *ἀποκάλυψις* of the salvation of God. The passage reads in Charles's Greek version: *ταῦτα γὰρ πάντα δέδωκαν ἡμῖν εἰς κληρονομίαν εἰπόντες. φυλάξατε τὰς ἐντολὰς τοῦ θεοῦ ἕως ὅτου ἀποκάλυψι κύριος τὸ σωτήριον αὐτοῦ πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, καὶ τοτὲ ὄψεσθε Ἐνὼχ καὶ Σήθ, καὶ Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ ἀνασταμένους ἐν δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει.* There is also a passage in Test. Lev. 18:14: *τοτὲ | ἀγαλλιάσεται Ἀβρ" καὶ Ἰσ" καὶ Ἰακ", κἀγὼ χαρήσομαι, καὶ | πάντες οἱ ἄγιοι ἐνδύσονται εὐφροσύνην.*

These passages clearly betray the existence of a pre-Christian conception that in the day when Messiah shall appear, the patriarchs will arise from Sheol,¹ and will exult (*ἀγαλλιάομαι*). The Messiah is the Priest-King, as he is conceived all through the Testaments. In view of the fact that in the sayings of Jesus, the Synoptic Gospels lay these Testaments so frequently under contribution (*vide* Charles, Test. XII Patr., Introd., pp. lxxviii ff.), and the assured position that has now been established, that the work is in the main pre-Christian, with certain Christian interpolations, it is not rash to suppose that the thought of 8:56 has a connection with

¹ Cf. Test. Jud. 25, 1: *καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἀναστήσεται Ἀ. καὶ Ἰσ. καὶ Ἰακ. εἰς ζωὴν.*

the ideas in that book. It is also very remarkable to note how many of the undoubted interpolations by a Christian hand are either from the Fourth Gospel, or bear a distinctly Johannine impress (e.g., Test. Lev. 10:2; 14:2; 17:2; 24:4; Test. Dan. 5:13; Test. Jos. 19:11; Test. Benj. 10:9). This at least indicates that the interpolators were sensitive to certain affinities already existing between the thought of the Testaments and the Fourth Gospel, in whatever form it lay before them.

The expression ἀγαλλιάομαι is used only in one other Johannine passage (vs. 35). It is a remarkable fact that, in the New Testament, the word is used with only one exception (Acts 16:34) of the emotion appropriate to the realization of the Messianic kingdom (Matt. 5:12; Luke 1:47; Acts 2:26; I Pet. 1:6, 8; 4:13; Rev. Rev. 19:7). It is used both of the exultation of Jesus after the resurrection, and of the exultation of believers in view of the Parousia. The noun ἀγαλλίασις is used in a similar connection (Luke 1:14, 44; Acts 2:46; Heb. 1:9; Jude vs. 24). This special use of the word is well exemplified in John 5:35. In this passage it is evidently implied that for a time the "Jews" were willing to regard the Baptist as Messiah. When the true Messiah comes, they do not show that exultation, although Jesus has a "witness greater than John." That witness is both the works of Jesus, and the presence of the Father in him. That presence is seen both in Jesus' words, which are the Father's voice, and in the bodily form of Jesus. "Ye have neither heard his voice at any time, nor seen his shape." Jesus they did not "receive"—a more or less technical term for the human attitude toward the kingdom,¹ here toward the Messiah himself—(vs. 43). The source of this exultation is the gift of eternal life (vs. 40). According to the Jewish tradition expressed in Test. XII Patr., the patriarchs become partakers of this life. They arise at the coming of Messiah in exultation. It is also interesting and suggestive to note that the word "glory" is connected with this experience in the context of vs. 35. δόξα is the glory conferred on Messiah by God, which is the occasion of true exultation: "Ye seek not the glory that cometh παρὰ τοῦ μόνου." The "Only One" is here not God but Jesus, the only

¹ Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, pp. 1246 f.

begotten, the only *υἱός*. He confers this glory upon those who believe in him (17:22).

In this use of *δόξα*, we may find a suggestion as to the use of *ἡμέρα*. The "day" of Jesus seems to be his appearance upon earth, regarded as a manifestation of the eternal glory, manifested in his works and words, and culminating in the final glory of the Cross, his *ὑψωσις*, when the kingdom is inaugurated. The Godward side of this manifestation is *δόξα*.

To return to the *ἀγαλλίασις* of the Patriarchs in Test. XII Patr., it is said, in another passage (Test. Lev. 18:2 ff.),¹ to take place in connection with the moment when the old priesthood has failed, and God will raise up a new Priest. The historic reference in the passage is to the rise of the Maccabean King-Priesthood. The kingdom is a messianic kingdom upon earth "for a multitude of days." The text of the passage is in many places obscure. In vs. 3, the words *ἐν ἡλίῳ ἡμέρα* are very difficult, and as Charles suggests, some form of text, yielding a translation like, "as the sun the day" is required. In any case the coming of the new Priest-King is spoken of as the shining of a light. His *ἄστρον* arises in heaven, and the conception evidently is that its light shines upon the figure of Messiah upon earth, and this light is given by him to the earth. In the words *οὗτος ἀναλάμψει*, Messiah is spoken of as himself the star. *ἡμέρα* is, however, throughout used in the plural in its natural sense.

¹ We may quote the passage in full, as it is regarded by Charles as on the whole free from Christian interpolation, and displays several remarkable affinities with the Johannine thought:

καὶ τότε ἔγερει κύριος ἱερέα καὶνόν,
 ᾧ πάντες οἱ λόγοι κυρίου ἀποκαλυφθήσονται,
 καὶ αὐτὸς ποιήσει κρίσιν ἀληθείας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐν πλήθει ἡμερῶν.
 καὶ ἀνατελεῖ ἄστρον αὐτοῦ ἐν οὐρανῷ ὡς βασιλείᾳ
 φωτίζων φῶς γνωσέως ἐν ἡλίῳ ἡμέρα,
 καὶ μεγαλυνθήσεται ἐν τῇ οἰκουμένῃ,
 οὗτος ἀναλάμψει ὡς ὁ ἥλιος ἐν τῇ γῇ,
 καὶ ἔξαρει πᾶν σκότος ἐκ τῆς ὑπ' οὐρανὸν
 καὶ ἔσται εἰρήνη ἐν πάσῃ τῇ γῇ.
 οἱ οὐρανοὶ ἀγαλλιάσονται ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις αὐτοῦ,
 καὶ ἡ γῆ χαρήσεται
 καὶ αἱ νεφέλαι εὐφρανθήσονται.

There must, however, be some special non-natural significance in the use of *ἡμέρα* in the singular in John 8:56. The whole expression, *τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ἐμὴν* is very remarkable. It must mean more than merely the duration of the earthly life of Jesus. The emphasis seems to be not on duration, but on the idea of "light." Num. 24:17 identifies the "star" with Messiah himself, and the name of the false Messiah, Bar Cochba, is "Son of the star." In Rev. 2:28; 22:16, Christ is called "the Morning Star," and Light is of course a favorite conception, not only in Jewish messianic literature, but especially in the Fourth Gospel itself, to denote the spiritual illumination accompanying the revelation of Messiah.¹

The question then arises whether *ἡμέρα* is not equivalent to the shining of the light and the star, which are spoken of as connected with the Messianic age and sometimes identified with Messiah himself. There is also, of course, bound up with the word in this connection, a certain idea of a preordained moment, such as "hour" has in the Fourth Gospel. We are also reminded of the words, "The day of the Lord is darkness and not light" (Amos vs. 18). Jesus also speaks of "that day" in 14:20; 16:23,26, the day when Christ shall be more fully revealed to his disciples. In this latter expression the "last day" is evidently not meant, and the reference can only be to the day of exaltation, the inauguration of the kingdom in power, in the Cross and Resurrection and Ascension, and the Coming of the Spirit, moments which are always viewed by the evangelist as one great moment. The implication is that the "day" spoken of in the foregoing passages fully dawned when Jesus was crucified. It may therefore be said that "my day" is more than merely the period of earthly life granted to Jesus, but the day that proceeds from him even now, as destined to be the Exalted King upon the cross. It is the light that comes into the world by him and through him, and is finally realized in the gift of the Spirit. That "day" is apparent throughout the earthly life, as

¹ Cf. John 1:9 with Test. Lev. 14:4, where, however, the resemblance is one chiefly of language, and there is no messianic reference in the latter passage. II Pet. 1:19 may also be cited, if we take *φωσφόρος*, "daystar," as meaning Christ, and referring to the Second Advent. (See my discussion of the passage in *Expos. Gk. Test.*, V, 131 f.)

the glimpses of his glory revealed to men in his works. In that case, "my day" would practically be a synonym for "the hour," "glory," "the light," and in general, as in the Fourth Gospel, the kingdom.

It is also remarkable that in Luke 17:24 the expression occurs, "So shall also the Son of Man be in his day."¹ The day that is denoted here is evidently the day of final judgment. Yet in a previous verse (22) we read, "The days will come when ye shall desire to see one of the days of the Son of Man, and ye shall not see it." With great probability, it is suggested (by Hahn) that *μίαν τῶν ἡμερῶν* in this verse ought really to be rendered "the first of the days of the Son of Man," on the analogy of Matt. 28:1 and Mark 16:2. The days of tribulation before the Second Advent are evidently meant by the evangelist. It may also be pointed out that the alternation of singular and plural in the expression, "days" and "day" of the Son of Man, and especially the utterance in vs. 22, which has been translated above as "the first of the days of the Son of Man," seems to point to the idea of a lengthened period after the Advent, when the Son of Man shall exercise his power on earth. It is also remarkable that the coming of the kingdom and the "day" or "days" of the Son of Man are distinguished. The kingdom is here already, but the Second Advent is still future and an object of desire. This is a consideration that will be found extremely suggestive in the consideration of the idea of the kingdom in the Fourth Gospel.

The Fourth Evangelist has a habit of applying to the whole moment of the Cross and Resurrection and Ascension of Jesus language that the synoptists apply to the Second Advent. Is this expression, "my day," in 8:56, an instance of this? And may it not be taken ultimately to refer to the sacrifice of Jesus, which was also his exaltation or *ὑψωσις*? Origen connects a rejoicing of Abraham with the moment of offering up his son (Lomm. 6:279). At the same time he says that Abraham was not one of those "who desired to see in vain" the day of the Lord. Evidently the conception is that the object of the exultation was not fully before the mind of Abraham, but that the exultation was given him in order that, in

¹Omitted by Westcott-Hort.

accordance with the divine decree, he might receive as a reward the vision of the Lord. I have adopted the interpretation given by Abbott (*Johannine Grammar*, 2689) to the thought of Origen. It seems to me to interpret well the sense of 8:56. The day of Jesus dawns on the world at the very beginning of the ministry. The shadow of the cross is apparent at Cana. Also, the day would really be the day of the crucifixion, corresponding to the idea that Abraham exulted at the sacrifice of his son, a type of the death of Jesus. Further, in accordance with Johannine thought, the "day," equally with the "glory" of Jesus, would be conceived as dawning even during the earthly life.

It is also noticeable that in the Old Testament ἀγαλλιάσθαι is the word specially employed to denote the experience of deliverance from death or Sheol. The Psalmist in Ps. 16:9 ff. speaks of the confident hope that he will not be condemned to the shadowy and ghostly and featureless existence of Sheol, while all the time his body is corrupting. The personality is conceived as disappearing with the body, and from this he is delivered, for even his "flesh shall rest in hope." His tongue "exults" (LXX) within the present life, and he also projects the experience forward in the after-life, as though exultation and hope were possible to those in Sheol. Abraham is not dead, and never was dead in the sense that he shared the gloomy joyless existence of Sheol. God delivered him from it. "God is not a God of the dead, but of the living" (Luke 20:38).

In this way, there is intertwined with the whole argument of the passage the question of the possibility of life after death; or rather of a conscious life for such as Abraham. The reply of Jesus is an extension of the words in 11:25, 26. Abraham's risen life is dependent upon his hope in the Messiah. There is no denial of this truth on the part of the opponents. What they deny is that the seeing by Abraham of such as Jesus, "not yet fifty years old," and therefore lacking one of the essential qualities of Messiah, that he should be a fully developed man when he appears, is possible. "Hath Abraham seen thee?" In other words, Abraham has not had the fulfilment of his hope, was not alive, and Jesus cannot be Messiah. Jesus replies to the notion of his own inferiority to Abraham by

asserting his existence before Abraham: "Before Abraham was, I am."

(2) As regards this assertion of pre-existence, there is undoubtedly, on the analogy of 4:26, an ellipsis after ἐγὼ εἰμι. The metaphysical notion of timeless, absolute existence is quite out of place here. There is no application of the thought of the Prologue. We may compare 1:30, where the Baptist speaks of one who "was before me." The real translation seems to be, "After me cometh a man, which is become [γέγονεν] before me; for he was before me" (Abbott, *Johannine Grammar*, 1896ff.). To show how the thought of the Prologue is not the basis of the thought in the Gospel, we may compare the substitution of ἀνθρώπος for ἀνὴρ in 1:15, a word unsuitable to the semi-philosophical nature of the Prologue. There the evangelist is appealing to his Greek readers by identifying Jesus with the Logos.

In order to investigate the question as to the nature of the pre-existence attributed to Jesus here, we must go back to the chapters in the Similitudes of Enoch, which speak of the Son of Man as pre-existent. In 46:1, 2, the Son of Man is seen as one who is "with God," hidden and kept by him in his presence. "The angel showed me all the hidden things, concerning that Son of Man, who he was, and whence he was, and why he went with the Head of Days." He is hidden before his manifestation on earth. In 61:7, it is said, "The Son of Man was hidden before him, and the Most High preserved him in the presence of his might, and revealed him to the elect." In 48:3 it is said that "Before the sun and the signs were created, before the stars of the heaven were made, his name was named before the Lord of Spirits." Does this mean only an ideal pre-existence? Dalman (*Words of Jesus*, p. 131) admits that in En. 46:62 a personal existence of the Messiah, celestial but not premundane, is taught. He also finds the same doctrine in 39:6 f. Charles, however, holds that in this latter passage (vss. 4-12) we have only a vision of the future messianic kingdom, and that details are not to be pressed. "In this, as in visions frequently, there is no exact observance of the unities of time and place." He goes on to point out that the passage at one time seems to imply that the history of the world is closed, and

the final judgment already passed, because "the Messiah is surrounded by all his righteous and elect ones"; and at another time, inasmuch as the righteous angels and the holy "in their mansions" are represented as praying and interceding for the children of men (39:5), the passage seems to imply that the final judgment is not yet come. Charles is therefore inclined to doubt whether the locality indicated by the vision is in heaven at all. It may be urged, however, that to say that in the vision Messiah is regarded as "surrounded by all his righteous and elect ones" is to go beyond what is expressed. Vs. 6 reads "And in that place mine eyes saw the elect one of righteousness, and of faith, and how righteousness shall prevail in his days, and the righteous and elect shall be without number before him for ever and ever." The completed account and gathering of the righteous is to take place in the future, and, in vs. 7, Enoch sees not "all the righteous and elect before him," but "All the righteous and elect [that are at present] before him, are beautifully resplendent as lights of fire," etc. These "righteous and elect," in so far as they consist of men, may be regarded as those saints who have died, and live the heavenly life with Messiah until the day when the kingdom appears upon the earth. It was certainly an accepted belief, in New Testament times, that a state of happiness or torment was allotted to departed souls preliminary to the general resurrection at the last day (Luke 16:22 ff.). Here in En. 39:4 "mansions" are spoken of as already allotted to those righteous who had died before the days of Messiah's appearance on earth. And whether the privilege is reserved for eminent men of God only, or for all righteous, the patriarchs at least are represented as in a state of conscious existence. There, presumably, they exult at the appearance of the messianic Priest-King (Test. XXX Patr. Lev. 18:14). They live, though not yet the life of the consummated kingdom. That resurrection is reserved until Messiah's kingdom and Messiah are revealed on earth.¹ We may also compare I Ezz. 14:9, "tu enim recipieris ab hominibus et converteris residuum cum filio meo et cum similibus tuis usquequo finiantur tempora."²

¹ Test. XII Patr. Jude 25:1, where the resurrection is to a renewed life on the present earth.

² Cf. Stanton, *Jewish and Christian Messiah*, p. 173.

On this interpretation it may be urged that there is nothing inconsistent in the vision in En. 39:6, 7, and it may be regarded (against Charles and with Dalman) as a passage ranking with En., chap. 46 and 62:7 as teaching a personal existence of Messiah.

This existence, however, Dalman contends is not premundane. He regards En. 48:6 as an interpolation. "He has been chosen and hidden before him, before the creation of the world, and for evermore." Dalman further contends that the statements as to pre-existence in the Similitudes of Enoch (and also II Ezr.) do not presuppose any human birth of Messiah. He is to make his appearance on earth as a fully developed personality. And he goes on to say that Judaism "has never known anything of a pre-existence peculiar to the Messiah antecedent to his birth as a human being." Dalman also stoutly denies any idea of pre-existence in Jewish thought. He opposes the idea of Baldensperger (*Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu*, 2d ed., p. 85) that, from the date of the appearance of the Similitudes of Enoch, the heavenly pre-existence of Messiah "came to be a dogma in apocalyptic circles."

This controversy, in which Dalman, Baldensperger, and Harnack are the protagonists, has a value for our purpose, inasmuch as the various modifications that are introduced into the views of each of these by the position of the others, will, I think, lead to a notion of pre-existence that will enable us to interpret John 8:56, and the other passages mentioned, in which pre-existence is asserted of the Messiah in the Fourth Gospel.

Harnack has drawn up a distinction (*History of Dogma*, pp. 318 ff.) between the Jewish and Hellenic conceptions of pre-existence. In this he has done a great service to the interpretation of New Testament thought on the matter. The main points in the Jewish conception, as he says, are (1) that the pre-existing thing in Jewish thought exists beforehand with God in the same way as it appears on earth, "with all the material attributes belonging to its essence"; (2) its manifestation on earth is merely a transition from concealment to publicity (*φανερόω*). There is no *assumptio naturae novae*. (3) The old Jewish theory of pre-existence is founded on the religious idea of the omniscience and omnipotence of God, "that God to whom the events of history do not come as

a surprise, but who guides their course." The primary idea is not to ennoble the creature but to exalt and bring to light the wisdom and the power of God.

In the Greek conception, on the other hand, (1) the idea is independent of the idea of God, and is based on the conception of the distinction between spirit and matter. The spirit is eternal, and the flesh is perishable; (2) if these spiritual beings are to appear in this finite world they cannot simply become visible, for they have no visible form. "They must really rather assume flesh, whether they throw it about them as a garment covering or really make it their own by a process of transformation or mixture"; (3) the material appearance is therefore regarded as something inadequate; (4) the objects in question themselves are meant to be ennobled, and not God.

As regards the Jewish conception there can be no doubt that it is essentially unphilosophical or rather unmetaphysical, inasmuch as it is the actual thing or person as manifested that pre-exists. At the same time Harnack goes on to attribute to Jewish thought a conception which, he holds, brings it into closer approximation to Hellenic, viz., the idea of the original in heaven, and the copy appearing on earth. This cannot be very sharply distinguished from the former idea of "manifestation." Harnack deduces this from the statements about the Tabernacle and its furniture, which are existent in heaven and are shown to Moses in the Mount (Exod. 25:9; 26:30; 28:8; Num. 8:4). And we also find that Harnack elevates this idea into a general philosophical conception as belonging to Jewish thought when he says that, among the ancient Jews, as among all the Semitic nations, "everything of real value that from time to time appears on earth has its existence in heaven." In other words, it exists with God, i.e., God possesses a knowledge of it; and for that reason it has a real being. As will be seen later, this must be regarded with Dalman as an un-Jewish, or at least un-Palestinian conception, and has no real place in Jewish thought. Where it occurs, it must be regarded as the result of the Hellenic spirit.

Harnack allows the influence of the Hellenic spirit on the older notion of pre-existence in the Jewish literature belonging to the

times of the Maccabees, and the following decades. The influence is seen (1) in the application for the first time of the idea of pre-existence to persons. Passages can be cited in the apocalyptic writings of this period, ascribing pre-existence to Moses, the patriarchs, etc. Passages from Enoch have already been cited as to the pre-existence of the Son of Man. The passage about Moses from Assumpt. Mos. c. 1 is, however, necessarily late, and the assertions about the pre-existence of the Temple, the Law, Jerusalem, are also found, only in later rabbinic and apocalyptic writings. Amid all these the notion of the pre-existence of a personal Messiah stands out as much the earliest form of the idea. The Greek influence is also seen (2) in the fact that the old distinction of original and copy is now interpreted as meaning that the copy is inferior and more imperfect. In the present aeon of the transient it cannot be equivalent to the original, and the time must be looked forward to when the original itself will make its appearance. This is illustrated in the New Testament by the conceptions of the earthly and heavenly Jerusalems, a heavenly and an earthly temple.

All this leads Harnack to contend that out of these general conditions of thought there sprang the earliest Jewish speculations about a personal Messiah. In the messianic ideas, however, themselves, Harnack can find no trace of Hellenic thought (*op. cit.*, p. 322). He holds that most Jews conceived Messiah as a man, and transferred to him, in obedience to prevailing conceptions, the idea of preterrestrial existence with God. This position of Harnack's requires to be traversed. The Hellenic influence cannot be denied, but in this essay the contention is that the idea of the pre-existence of Messiah is the earliest form in which the pre-existence conception appears in Jewish thought, and that out of it sprang the other applications of pre-existence to the Temple, the Law, the Holy City.

Baldensperger (*op. cit.*, p. 89, n. 1) accepts in the main Harnack's argument, but introduces into it a very important and valuable modification. He holds that the desire to glorify God is not the real motive in the idea of pre-existence. Instead of that he significantly, and with a deeper insight into Jewish thought, substitutes the

motive of "the deep necessity for assurance of salvation." The acceptance of this motive has the great advantage that it enables Baldensperger to explain the idea of the personal pre-existence of Messiah without having recourse to the influence of Hellenic thought. Baldensperger, however, has complicated the position by asserting that at the basis of the belief in a pre-existent Messiah there lies the belief in the pre-existence of individual souls, at least in the form that each individual soul is in the hand of God. He cites Ps. 139:15 in illustration. This psalm, however, only refers to prenatal existence.¹ The idea of Messiah's pre-existence is not subsequent to, but long prior to, the idea of the pre-existence of souls. The eternal pre-existence of all souls is not definitely taught until the Platonic idea of pre-existence of souls found its way into Jewish thought in Egypt. We find it in the *Secrets of Enoch* 23:5; *Wisdom of Solomon* 8:19; Philo *De Somn.* i. 22; *De Gigant.* 3 (cf. Charles, *Secrets of Enoch*, note, 23:5). All these instances are due to the influence of Platonic thought. Dalman is right in saying that "the conception of Messiah's pre-existence is quite distinct from the later Jewish doctrine of the pre-existence of the souls of all men" (*Words of Jesus*, p. 131). This conception of Messiah's pre-existence may thus be regarded as springing essentially from "the deep necessity for the assurance of personal salvation." The first clear utterance of the idea of the pre-existence of Messiah is found in Dan., chap. 7, which undoubtedly implies it. It is true that the Son of Man is there a human figure representing the chosen kingdom, the saints of the Most High, but one cannot resist the impression in this chapter that the writer is there applying to the community language that had previously been used of the real figure of the Son of Man. It will be noted that the vision is followed by an interpretation, in which the figure of the Son of Man is interpreted of the nation. It is quite possible that underlying the thought in Dan. 7:13 there is an earlier tradition about a Son of Man, "a heavenly personality parallel to the figure of Messiah, who returns with divine powers of restoring life at the end of history." Paul's language about "the man from heaven" would

¹ Cf. Jer. 1:5; Schulz, *Old Testament Theology*, II, 251 ff.

² Moffatt, *Theology of the Gospels*, pp. 158-59; cf. Gressmann, *Ursprung der Israelitisch-jüdischen Eschatologie*, pp. 360 f.

point to some tradition of this kind. The expression in Daniel, "one like unto a Son of Man," would indicate that the writer knew that in applying the notion to the chosen nation he is taking a novel step. That same tradition would therefore appear again on the surface in the older sense in the Similitudes of Enoch. The dates now usually assigned to Daniel and to the Similitudes of Enoch would render this idea not improbable. The Similitudes may not have been written more than 50 years after Daniel. Daniel may be dated about 170 B.C., and the Similitudes in the first half of the first century B.C. It is specially noticeable, in connection with this hypothesis, that in Daniel God is the Judge, probably because it would be impossible to ascribe this function to the saints of the Most High, and that in Enoch what is probably the older form of the tradition appears, in which the Son of Man is Judge. It is also not improbable that some such form of the tradition is adumbrated in Mic. 5:2: "Out of thee shall one come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth are from of old, from everlasting."

This conception, then, that the real motive in the idea of the pre-existence of Messiah is the necessity for the assurance of salvation, would gradually, as the times became more distressful, lead on to the idea of the pre-existence of "the throne of glory," the Law, the Temple, Repentance; but the idea of Messiah pre-existence must be regarded as arising prior to and independently of the idea as applied to these. In this connection we may revert for a moment to the use that is made by Harnack and others of the passages in Exodus which speak of the patterns shown to Moses in the Mount. It is impossible to think that an abstract conception existed early in Jewish thought, to the effect that everything of value pre-exists in heaven. The interpretation of this idea that God possesses a knowledge of the thing, and for that reason it has a real being, which is given by Harnack, must, with Dalman, be stoutly condemned as an entirely un-Jewish, or at all events un-Palestinian, conception (Dalman, *op. cit.*, p. 299). Abstract theories of this description are nowhere in Judaism productive of religious beliefs, except where they have blended with and modified, under Hellenic influence, the former concrete representations. The

notion of pre-existence in general must have a practical and not a theoretical origin, and that practical origin has been most clearly stated by Baldensperger as the necessity for the assurance of salvation. Dalman rightly explains the models of the tabernacle and its furniture, shown to Moses in the Mount, as meaning no more than "that the oral instruction given to Moses, being insufficient to guide him with precision, was supplemented by the exhibition of models" (*op. cit.*, p. 299). These passages about the models simply mean that a house of God is not to be constructed to please human fancies, but according to exact divine prescription.

This criticism of Dalman's is, however, but a stage on the way toward a complete denial of the presence of a doctrine of pre-existence in Jewish thought proper. He says that even the idea of the pre-existence of Messiah is to be interpreted as he interprets the supposed pre-existence of the model of the tabernacle in Exodus. His pre-existence is simply existence prior to a certain event, viz., his appearance on earth. The meaning is that he comes from God and not from men. He denies any such idea as the premundane existence of Messiah in pre-Christian thought. He admits a personal and real existence of Messiah, prior to his appearance on earth. It is a necessary presupposition of his miraculous superhuman appearance. "For all these ideas of pre-existence, earthly and heavenly, a potent stimulus lay in the cherished hope that the redemption was imminent, or might at any rate come at any moment. In that case, of course, the Messiah was already in existence; the only question was where. The divine providence comes here into consideration because it is due to it that all things have been so well ordered that the divine scheme of the world should realize itself without impediment" (*op. cit.*, p. 302).

What then about the statements as to pre-existence of Messiah in rabbinic literature and in apocalyptic? Dalman lays emphasis on the fact that only the name of Messiah is said to be pre-existent. The Messiah had to appear as a full-grown developed man, and the opinion generally was that until his manifestation he should remain unknown upon the earth. The pre-existence of the name only of Messiah he interprets as meaning ideal pre-existence. Dalman ought to apply the same criticism to his own conception as he

applies to Baldensperger and Harnack's conception of the existence of original and copy. Both are really un-Jewish. This is also to misinterpret the significance of "the name" in Jewish thought. For all practical purposes the name is identical with the thing or person. Moreover, in the post-Christian rabbinic literature, alongside the conception of the pre-existence of the name of Messiah, there actually exists a belief in his real pre-existence in a pre-mundane form. Edersheim (*Life and Times of Jesus Christ*, I, 175) quotes from the Talmud the sentence which declares that from the time of Judah's marriage, "God busied himself with creating the light of the Messiah," and points out that it is significantly added, "Before the first oppressor [Pharaoh] was born, the final Deliverer [Messiah, the Son of David] was already born." Edersheim also refers to the well-known comment of Yalkut on Isa., chap. 60, which states that the light of Messiah was hidden beneath the throne of his glory for the Messiah and his age. That this form of existence is not ideal is shown by the other story in the Talmud, that Messiah had actually been born in the royal palace at Bethlehem, bore the name Menahem ("Comforter"), was discovered by one R. Judan, but had been carried away by a storm.

Now, even although these doctrines are late and post-Christian, it is impossible to believe that they were influenced by Christian thought. So far as can be seen, the influence of Christian thought upon Jewish messianic beliefs acted in the opposite direction, and led to strong emphasis on the human side.¹

The matter, however, of a premundane existence for Messiah in pre-Christian thought is really settled by the assigning of a pre-Christian date to the Similitudes of Enoch. The passage, En. 48:2, 3, 6, 7a, says that not only the name of Messiah was named "before the sun and the signs were created, before the stars of the heaven were made." It also asserts that "He has been chosen and hidden before the (Lord of Spirits) before the creation of the world and for evermore." There are passages in 4 Ezr. 12:32 and 13:26

¹ Cf. Schürer, *The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*, II, ii, 162. He quotes the famous saying in Justin, *Trypho* c. 49, We all expect that the Christ will be born as a man from among men. Also a Talmudic passage, Jer. Taanith 2:1: "Rabbi Abbahu saith: If a man says to thee—I am God, he lies; I am the Son of Man, he will at last repent it; I ascend to heaven, if he said it he will not prove it."

which speak of Messiah as kept. "He whom the Most High hath kept a great season" (13:26), "whom the Most High hath kept unto the end of days" (12:32). The Enoch passages show that the idea of a real pre-existence of Messiah, in the sense of a pre-mundane existence, had a place in apocalyptic thought. It has, of course, to be remembered that the whole conception of the Son of Man in Enoch is unique in Jewish literature, but against this has to be set the fact that there exist so many similarities of thought and expression in the books of the New Testament (see Charles ed., p. 43). These, widespread as they are amongst the various New Testament writings, would seem to point not only to literary dependence, but also to the existence of a milieu of apocalyptic thought in New Testament times, which itself comes to expression in Enoch. Out of nearly 100 parallels adduced by Charles from the book with the thought of the New Testament, more than half of these are taken from the Similitudes. Moreover, the titles, "Christ," or "the Anointed One"; "the Righteous One"; "the Elect One"; appear in Enoch for the first time in apocalyptic literature as applied to the expected Messiah, as against their application in previous literature to actual historic individuals. Also, the title Son of Man is found in Enoch for the first time, as a definite title. We are therefore, in the Similitudes, in the presence of a powerful trend of Jewish thought which probably exercised an influence on the mind of our Lord himself. There can be no doubt that the pre-mundane existence of the Messiah is meant in 8:56; and it is stated still more explicitly in 17:5, 24. In the latter verse the exact phrasing of Enoch is reproduced.

The pre-existence of Messiah is hinted at in Dan. 7:13, 14. The kingdom is conferred upon the Son of Man, and is an everlasting kingdom, without beginning, and without end. The Son of Man comes from the darkness where he is hidden. The four beasts in this vision come up from the great sea, but it is not stated whence the "One like unto a Son of Man" comes. Evidently he is represented as coming from some region in heaven where he is hidden. It is notable that this pre-existence, only hinted at in Daniel, is taken for granted in Enoch (cf. Schulz, *op. cit.*, II, 446).

The four passages quoted from the Fourth Gospel at the beginning of this chapter I propose to take as expressing on the part of Jesus, this consciousness of Messianic pre-existence. They are not to be regarded as implying a recollection of a former eternal existence, but, if they are to be regarded as uttering an authentic thought in the consciousness of Jesus, and not as creations of the evangelist's own thought, they must in some way be brought into line with other apocalyptic utterances in the Synoptic Gospels. This can be done only on one interpretation of them. The position adopted by the present writer with regard to the use by Jesus of apocalyptic imagery is that he used it in moments of special exaltation as a form of self-expression. It is so in these passages. These moments of tense feeling are found in the Fourth Gospel, equally with the Synoptics. We have an instance in what we have attempted to prove is an apocalyptic utterance in 2:19; Jesus speaks in 7:19 with such passionate insight into the murderous purposes of his opponents that they said *δαίμόνιον ἔχεις* (cf. 8:48). We may compare 7:37 (*ἔκραξεν*); 7:46; 12:22-36; 18:6 (cf. J. Weiss, *Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes*, p. 54, n. 1). At such moments of intense feeling, when his vocation burned and gleamed before him, he made use of the language of current messianic thought.

In 6:62, "Son of Man" is object of *θεωρῆτε*, and subject of *ἦν τὸ πρότερον*. "Son of Man" is here no ideal conception. He is a real individual, with whom Jesus identifies himself. Moreover, the "glory" spoken of in 17:5 is a glory possessed *realiter*, before the world was. *παρὰ σεαυτῷ* of the former clause in this passage must be equivalent to *παρὰ σοι* of the second. Similarly, 17:24 can be interpreted only of One who conceives himself as really pre-existent, the object of the love of God. So Jesus in the Fourth Gospel is the "Son of Man," "who has come down from heaven."

This conception of the pre-existence of the Son of Man has much more right to be regarded as the dogmatic conception that governs the thought of the Gospel than the Logos-conception of the Prologue. It is essentially an apocalyptic conception. The evangelist, interpreting the messianic consciousness of Jesus himself, moves with freedom amid the apocalyptic ideas that his Master chose as forms of self-expression. Instead of doing, as the syn-

optists do often, simply renarrating his apocalyptic utterances, and sometimes heightening the apocalyptic imagery (cf. Streeter, in *Oxford Studies in Synoptic Gospels*), the Fourth Evangelist interprets the thoughts of Jesus in these matters. He enables us to understand that he was not bound by the details of apocalyptic thought. He represents him as appropriating and making more definite the notion of pre-existence that is hinted at in Daniel.¹ He also represents him as appropriating and making still more definite other conceptions suggested in the vision of Daniel. The appearance of Jesus upon earth is really parallel to the appearance of the Son of Man from where he has been hidden from all eternity, in Daniel. His earthly life is a progress "to the Father": "I go to the Father." In Daniel, the One like unto a Son of Man comes to the Ancient of Days, "and they brought him near before him." Thereupon "dominion and glory, and a kingdom are conferred upon him."

¹ The real source of Jesus' freedom in regard to apocalyptic thought is found in his consciousness of a unique relationship to the Father, and the place occupied by the cross in his thought, on the lines of the Suffering Servant idea. I do not regard the ellipsis after *ἐμὶ* in *ἐγὼ ἐμὶ* of 8:58 as fully supplied by *Χριστός*. The expression *ἐγὼ ἐμὶ* is perhaps consciously and deliberately an ellipsis, on the ground that the Fourth Evangelist does not identify Jesus solely with the Messiah. In the Fourth Gospel Jesus seems to avoid at any time verbally identifying himself with the Messiah, perhaps in order that his consciousness of his sonship and the messianic consciousness might not appear merely to coincide. The former absorbs the latter.